## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS DALLAS DIVISION

ISMAEL H. PADILLA,	)
Plaintiff,	)
v.	)
	)
DIR. TX., PRISON SYSTEM, et al.,	)
Defendants.	) Civil Action No. 3:21-CV-0908-C-BH

## ORDER

Before the Court are the Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge therein advising the Court that Plaintiff's *Motion to Appeal; Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation, and Provide Info that, 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) does Not Exists [sic] in Pro Se Litigation* should be construed as a motion to alter or amend the judgment under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) and should be denied.<sup>1</sup>

The Court conducts a *de novo* review of those portions of the Magistrate Judge's report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which a timely objection is made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). Portions of the report or proposed findings or recommendations that are not the subject of a timely objection will be accepted by the Court unless they are clearly erroneous or contrary to law. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989).

After due consideration and having conducted a *de novo* review, the Court finds that Plaintiff's objections should be **OVERRULED**. The Court has further conducted an independent review of the Magistrate Judge's findings and conclusions and finds no error. It is

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Plaintiff has filed a "Motion to Rebutt and Appeal the Discriminatory Issues"—which the Court construes as the filing of objections to the Magistrate Judge's Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation.

ADOPTED as the findings and conclusions of the Court. For the reasons stated therein, the Court ORDERS that Plaintiff's Motion—construed as a motion to alter or amend the judgment under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e)—is hereby DENIED. The Clerk of Court is directed to STRIKE the Court's Order of June 29, 2021.

SO ORDERED.

SAM/R. CUMMINGS

SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE